

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/085,169	02/25/2002	Jose Castillo Deniega	IFLOW.063DVI	3825	
20995	7590 10/18/2005		EXAMINER		
	MARTENS OLSON & E	LAM, ANN Y			
2040 MAIN FOURTEEN	STREET TH FLOOR		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA 92614			1641		
			DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application I	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/085,169		DENIEGA ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Ann Y. Lam		1641				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN isions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by eply received by the Office later than three months after the ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS CFR 1.136(a). In no event, h ion. period will apply and will ex y statute, cause the applicati	COMMUNICATION nowever, may a reply be timpire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONEI	I. sely filed the mailing date of this co O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un	This action is non- llowance except for	formal matters, pro		e merits is			
Dispositi	on of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,11 and 12 is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and Papers	thdrawn from consid						
	•							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exa The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the o The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) to the drawing(s) be hecorrection is required in	eld in abeyance. Seef the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CI	` '			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
2) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 r No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08) 5)	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informal Pa	ite	D-152)			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 26, 2005 has been entered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5-7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072, in view of Crowley et al., 6,004,279. Lampropoulos et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed.

As to claims 1 and 5, Lampropoulos et al. discloses an elongated tube having a plurality of exit holes increasing in size along the length of the catheter (column 7, lines

Art Unit: 1641

57-67), so that a fluid flowing therein will flow through substantially all of said exit holes at a substantially equal rate (column 7, lines 57-67), a lumen of said catheter having a cross-sectional flow area, said exit holes having a non-variable, combined cross-sectional flow area less than the flow area of the lumen so that the exit holes define a flow restricting orifice of the catheter (column 8, lines 8-13), the catheter being formed from a material that is non-reactive to anatomical system. (Since the slots are normally in a closed position, the cross-sectional area of the slots are considered to be smaller than the cross section area of the lumen.)

However, Lampropoulos et al. do not disclose that the exit slots are normally open. (Rather, Lampropoulos et al. disclose that the exit slots are normally closed.)

Crowley et al. however disclose that normally open slots and normally closed slots are functional equivalents as means for infusing fluid from inside a catheter to outside the catheter. In particular, Crowley et al. discloses an embodiment (fig. 5, and col. 8, lines 62-67), wherein the apertures (62) are open and an alternative embodiment (fig. 7, col. 7, lines 55-66), with a slit 98 that is normally closed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the Lampropoulos et al. slits for a normally open slot as taught by Crowley et al., because Crowley et al. teach that normally closed slits and normally open slots are functional equivalents for infusing fluid from inside a catheter.

As to the following claims, Lampropoulos et al. discloses the limitations as follows.

Art Unit: 1641

As to claim 5, since Lampropoulos discloses such a catheter, Lampropoulos therefore discloses the steps of manufacturing the catheter, including the step of providing exit holes having a non-variable size.

As to claims 2 and 6, the holes are provided throughout the circumference of the catheter (see figure 6).

As to claims 7 and 11, the exit holes are in at least one row aligned with a longitudinal axis of the catheter (see fig. 16.)

Moreover, as to claim 3, Lampropoulos et al. does not disclose the specific diameter of the exit holes. However, the diameter of the exit holes that would achieve the optimum results, i.e., the most uniform delivery of fluids, as taught by Lampropoulos, can be discovered through routine experimentation and thus would be obvious. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

2. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampropoulos et al., 5,817,072, in view of Crowley et al., 6,004,279, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Stevens, 5,536,261.

Lampropoulos et al. in view of Crowley et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed (see above), except for the motivation to provide a closed distal end.

(Although Crowley et al. teaches a closed distal end, Crowley et al. is silent as to the advantages of a closed distal end.)

Art Unit: 1641

Stevens discloses a catheter having openings for fluid delivery in the circulatory system. Stevens teaches that the catheter has a closed distal end which encourages lateral flow as would be desirable (column 2, lines 35-37.) It would have been obvious to provide a closed end as taught by Stevens in the Lampropoulos catheter because Stevens teaches that a closed distal end provides the advantage of encouraging lateral flow as would be desirable for delivering fluid in the circulatory system.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejections. (Crowley et al. provides the motivation to substitute a normally closed slit for a normally open aperture.)

### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Appling et al., 5,267,979, discloses that slits instead of holes in the distal segments of catheters are known in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann Y. Lam whose telephone number is 571-272-0822. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Sat 11-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on 571-272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/085,169

Art Unit: 1641

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A.L.

LONG V. LE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

10/14/05

Page 6